

GP-303047

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action mailed on February 25, 2005, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration based on the above claim amendments and the following remarks. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance. Claims 1-22 were pending in the prior non-provisional application. Claims 1-2, 4-5, 19 and 22 have been amended, leaving Claims 1-22 for consideration upon the entry of the present amendment.

Support for Claim Amendments

No new matter has been added by the amendments. Claims 1, 19 and 22 have been amended to include the element "the predicting including performing pattern recognition, wherein input to the predicting includes the results of the comparing" as included in original Claim 2. Claims 2, 4 and 5 have been amended to comply with the amendment to Claim 1.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 1, 7-16, 18-20 and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,748,318B1 to Jones ("Jones").

Applicants respectfully submit that the elements of amended Claim 1 are not found, expressly or inherently, in Jones and that therefore Claim 1 is patentable over Jones. The Examiner has stated, on page 6 of the Office Action, that "Jones does not disclose that pattern-recognition technology is used for predicting a vehicle destination." Therefore, for at least this reason, Claim 1 is patentable over Jones. Because they depend from Claim 1, Claims 7-16 and 18 are also patentable over Jones for at least the same reasons that Claim 1 is patentable over Jones. In addition, similar to Claim 1, Claims 19 and 22 have also been amended to include the element "the predicting including performing pattern recognition." Therefore, Claims 19 and 22 are also patentable over Jones. Because it depends from Claim 19, Claim 20 is also patentable over Jones for at least the same reasons that Claim 19 is patentable over Jones.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 2-6, 17 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over

GP-303047

Jones in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,567,745B2 to Fuchs et al. ("Fuchs"). Applicants traverse this rejection and submit that Jones in view of Fuchs does not teach or suggest all of the elements of Claims 2-6, 17 and 21.

Amended Claim 1 includes the element "the predicting (a destination for said vehicle) including performing pattern recognition." This element was included in original Claim 2. The Examiner has stated that Jones does not disclose that pattern recognition technology is used for predicting a vehicle destination. The Examiner looks to Fuchs to cure this deficiency in Jones and refers to Column 5, lines 5-12 of Fuchs which recites "The voice command and control system 12 provides automatic voice recognition of voice communication from the user. The voice command and control system 12 processes voice communications to determine whether a spoken word or speech pattern matches any of the stored grammars or vocabulary. When the system 12 identifies a speech pattern, the system sends an output signal to implement the specific function associated with the specific pattern to the audio decoding and playback portion." This section of Fuchs teaches a voice recognition system that uses speech patterns to recognize spoken words. This is not the same as, nor does it suggest, "predicting a destination for said vehicle, the predicting including performing pattern recognition." Furthermore, input to a voice recognition system is voice data which is not the same as the input to the predicting recited in amended Claim 1 which includes the results of "comparing said vehicle position data for a current trip to vehicle position data for one or more previous trips." Therefore, Fuchs does not cure the deficiency in Jones pointed out by the Examiner.

Therefore, neither Jones nor Fuchs, alone or in combination, teach or suggest all of the elements of Claim 1. For at least this reason, Claim 1 is patentable over Jones in view of Fuchs. Because they depend from Claim 1, Claims 2-6 and 17 are also patentable over Jones in view of Fuchs for at least the reasons advanced with respect to Claim 1. Claim 19 includes elements that are similar to Claim 1 and is patentable over Jones in view of Fuchs for at least the reasons advanced with respect to Claim 1. Because it depends from Claim 19, Claim 21 is also patentable over Jones in view of Fuchs.

GP-303047

Conclusion

It is believed that the foregoing amendments and remarks fully comply with the Office Action and that the claims herein should now be allowable to Applicants. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance is requested.

If there are any additional charges with respect to this Amendment or otherwise, please charge them to Deposit Account No. 06-1130 maintained by Applicants' attorneys.

Respectfully submitted,

CANTOR COLBURN LLP

By 

Anne Davis Barry
Registration No. 47,408

Date: May 24, 2005
CANTOR COLBURN LLP
55 Griffin Road South
Bloomfield, CT 06002
Telephone (860) 286-2929
Facsimile (860) 286-0115
Customer No.: 23413